

**REMARKS**

**Withdrawn Rejections**

**In items 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1-17 in the previous Office Action dated July 9, 2008 have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment dated October 6, 2008.**

However, the note is not correct. Actually, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections over Hosonuma and other references are still maintained.

**Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)**

**Claims 1 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Matsumoto (JPO Website Machine English Translation of JP 2003-043257).**

Claims 1 and 4-7 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejection has become moot.

**Claims 8-10, 12, 16-17 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Matsumoto as applied to claims 1, 4-7 above, and further in view of Yoshida (US 2001/0030726).**

**Claims 8, 11, 13-17 are also rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Matsumoto in view of as applied to claims 1, 4-7 above, and further in view of Abileah (US 5,907,378).**

As the Examiner admitted, Matsumoto does not teach or suggest laminated film the polarizing film and a retardation film having a slow axis.

Claim 8 has been amended as follows:

8. A laminated film comprising:  
    a polarizing film comprising a first long polymer film and a dichroic substance, and having an MD direction and a TD direction; and  
    a retardation film comprising a second long polymer film, and having an MD direction and TD direction,  
    wherein the MD direction of the polarizing film corresponds to the MD direction of the retardation film,  
    wherein the polarizing film has an absorption axis in the TD direction,  
    wherein the retardation film has a slow axis in the MD direction,  
    wherein the length in the MD direction of each of the polarizing film and the retardation film is not smaller than five times as long as the length in the TD direction of each of the polarizing film and retardation film, and  
    wherein the polarizing film is produced by stretching the first long polymer film in the TD direction and shrinking the first long polymer film in the MD direction.

The Examiner alleged that Yoshida and Abileah disclose “a laminated film comprising a polarizing film and a retardation film having a slow axis that is orthogonal to the absorption axis of the adjacent polarizing film”, and therefore, the present invention is obvious.

However, Yoshida and Abileah do not mention “MD direction and TD direction of the retardation film.” Also, Yoshida and Abileah do not disclose “the retardation film has a slow axis in the MD direction”.

Moreover, the film of the related art is produced by stretching a long film in the TD direction to form a retardation film having a slow axis in the TD direction. Such a film has a drawback that the direction of the slow axis is apt to vary because of a bowing phenomenon where the center portion of the film progresses compared with the case where the long film is stretched in the lengthwise direction to provide a retardation film having a slow axis in the

lengthwise direction.

On the other hand, in the present invention, the film stretched in the MD direction can be used as a retardation turn, and variation in the direction of the slow axis due to the bowing phenomenon hardly occurs so that excellent axial accuracy can be obtained. The obtained laminated film can optically compensate the retardation in a liquid crystal cell with high accuracy to achieve uniform liquid crystal display and attain widening of the viewing angle.

Furthermore, in the present invention, when the long polarizing film is combined with a long retardation film having a slow axis in the MD direction, the orthogonal relation between the absorption axis of the polarizing film and the slow axis of the retardation film can be formed by such lamination that the MD directions of the long films are made to correspond to each other, since being a long polarizing film having an absorption axis in the TD direction. A laminated film made of the laminate can be produced efficiently in a laminating process in which the long films rolled up are unrolled out successively.

Thus, Yoshida and Abileah do not teach or suggest, among other things, "wherein the polarizing film has an absorption axis in the TD direction, wherein the retardation film has a slow axis in the MD direction, wherein the length in the MD direction of each of the polarizing film and the retardation film is not smaller than five times as long as the length in the TD direction of each of the polarizing film and retardation film, and wherein the polarizing film is produced by stretching the first long polymer film in the TD direction and shrinking the first long polymer film in the MD direction."

For at least these reasons, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the combination of

Application No.: 10/566,714  
Art Unit: 1794

Response under 37 CFR §1.116  
Attorney Docket No.: 053565

Matsumoto and Yoshida or the combination of Matsumoto and Abileah.

**Claims 1, 4-7 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Hosonuma (US 4,643,529).**

Claims 1 and 4-7 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejection has become moot.

**Claims 8-10, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Hosonuma (US 4,643,529) as applied to claims 1, 4-7 above, and further in view of Yoshida (US 2001/0030726).**

As the Examiner admitted, like Matsumoto, Hosonuma does not teach or suggest laminated film comprising the polarizing film and a retardation film having a slow axis. As discussed above, Yoshida does not remedy the deficiencies of Hosonuma.

For at least these reasons, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Hosonuma and Yoshida. Claims 9, 10, 12, 16 and 17, depending from claim 8, also patentably distinguish over the combination of Hosonuma and Abileah for at least the same reasons.

**Claims 8, 11, 13-17 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Hosonuma (US 4,643,529) in view of as applied to claims 1, 4-7 above, and further in view of Abileah (US 5,907,378).**

As the Examiner admitted, like Matsumoto, Hosonuma does not teach or suggest laminated film comprising the polarizing film and a retardation film having a slow axis. As

Application No.: 10/566,714  
Art Unit: 1794

Response under 37 CFR §1.116  
Attorney Docket No.: 053565

discussed above, Yoshida does not remedy the deficiencies of Hosonuma.

For at least these reasons, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Hosonuma and Abileah. Claims 11, 13-17, depending from claim 8, also patentably distinguish over the combination of Hosonuma and Abileah for at least the same reasons.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Sadao Kinashi

Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 48,075  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/ar